LASIOPTERA MEIGEN, 1818: APPLICATION TO PRESERVE THE GENERIC NAME IN ITS ACCUSTOMED MEANING (DIPTERA, CECIDOMYIIDAE). Z.N.(S.) 1822

By Curtis W. Sabrosky and Raymond J. Gagné (Entomology Research Division, Agr. Res. Serv., U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

A long-overlooked type designation threatens to cause serious confusion in the economically important genus *Lasioptera* in the gall midges of the dipterous family CECIDOMYIIDAE. Use of the plenary powers is requested to preserve the name in its long established meaning.

2. The genus *Lasioptera* was proposed by Meigen (1818 : 88) with eight included species, arranged in three groups:

- A. Four species (very short basitarsus), including L. picta Meigen and L. albipennis (Meigen, 1804).
- B. Three species (elongated basitarsus), one or perhaps two of them doubtfully referred to the genus.
- C. One species (unassigned to A or B), L. juniperina (Linnaeus, 1758).

3. No type-species was designated. Authors gradually confined Lasioptera to Meigen's group A, and modern authors followed this and cited Coquillett's designation of albipennis as the type-species (1910: 558). This was also accepted in the new "Catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico" (Stone et al., 1965: 270), but in a list of corrections to that Catalog, Sabrosky (1967: 118) has recently pointed out the long-overlooked designation of L, picta Meigen by Karsch (1878: 14). Fortunately, the two species L. picta and L. albipennis are congeneric, and this change causes no difficulty.

4. Now it has been discovered—surprisingly so in view of the prominence of Rondani in dipterology—that there is yet another overlooked designation for *Lasioptera*, still earlier than that of Karsch. In 1860: 291, Rondani designated as type-species *Tipula juniperina* Linnaeus (as "*Tuniperina*", an obvious typographical error). This was already the type-species, by monotypy, of *Oligotrophus* Latreille (1805), another important genus in the CECIDONYIDAE. The consequences of acceptance of Rondani's designation would be (1) to synonymize *Lasioptera*, one of the oldest and best known genera in the family and the type-genus of tribe LASIOPTERINI and supertribe LASIOPTERIDI, under *Oligotrophus*, itself the type-genus of a tribe OLIGOTROPHINI and supertribe OLIGOTROPHIDI, and (2) to require another name for the *Lasioptera* of authors recognized since 1818 and for the tribe and supertribe based upon it.

5. Search for a replacement name for Lasioptera, if that were decided upon, would lead one into further problems. An obvious candidate would be Diomyza, a Megerle manuscript name cited by Meigen under Lasioptera (1818 : 88) and in two manuscript names for species, one each under L. picta and L. fusca (: 89). It was adopted by Stephens (1829a : 53; 1829b : 240), who cited Megerle as author and listed three nomina nuda, and by Stephens (1846 : 21), who doubtfully referred to it Lasioptera pulchra Meigen (1830).

Westwood (1840 : 126) recognized the genus *Diomyza* (again with Megerle as author), gave a brief description, and cited as type-species *D. fuliginosa* Stephens (plate 42, fig. 4). The plate reference refers to Stephens (1846), but there the figure is actually called "*D. pulchra?*". *D. fuliginosa* is a *nomen mulum* from Stephens (1829a, b) but it is made available by Westwood, by indication (bibliographic reference to the excellent coloured figure in Stephens, 1846). Obviously then, the name *Diomyza* has been "treated as an available name with its original date and authorship" and "adopted as the name of a taxon" (Code, 1964, Art. 11d), and must be treated as available. Incidentally it has rarely been used, and then not always correctly. For example, Schiner (1864 : 410) credited *Diomyza* to Stephens and claimed to use it in his sense (elongated basitarsus) for the species of Meigen's "B" group, but Schiner misinterpreted Stephen's excellent coloured figure, which is actually a true *Lasioptera* of Meigen's "A" group (abbreviated basitarsus).

6. If Diomyza be considered to replace Lasioptera, one faces the question of the type-species of a generic name in synonymy. Some have interpreted it as (1) automatically the type of the name under which it is synonymized (objective synonymy), (2) automatically, by considering the senior name as a replacement for the manuscript synonym, the type-species of either when established (Art. 67i), or (3) the species with which it is specifically associated in the publication in which it first appeared. Under the first two interpretations the type-species would be that of Lasioptera, hence juniperina by designation of Rondani (1860), thus involving Diomyza in the same difficulty as Lasioptera. Under the third interpretation, Diomyza was specifically associated with L. picta and L. fusca. Coquillett (1910: 533) stated that the type was picta, and this could be recognized as designation even though his reason (monotypy) was erroneous (Art. 69a (iii)).

7. After considering the various difficulties, the threatened change of a long-established name to a new meaning and its replacement by a long buried name that in itself has problems, we conclude that the best solution would be to set aside the overlooked designation by Rondani.

8. Accordingly, the International Commission is requested to take the following actions:

- (1) For the nominal genus Lasioptera Meigen, to use its plenary powers to set aside the type designation by Rondani (1860) and any others that may conflict prior to that of Karsch (1878), and to fix that of Karsch as the valid type designation;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name Lasioptera Meigen, 1818 (gender : feminine), type-species, by designation of Karsch, 1878 (accepted under the plenary powers), Lasioptera picta Meigen;
- (3) to place the specific name *picta* Meigen, 1818, as published in the binomen *Lasioptera picta* Meigen (type-species of *Lasioptera* Meigen), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

LITERATURE CITED

COQUILLETT, D. W. 1910. The type-species of the North American genera of Diptera. U.S. Natl. Mus. Proc. 37: 499-647

KARSCH, F. 1878. Revision der Gallmücken. 57 pp., 1 pl. Münster. MEIGEN, J. W. 1818. Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten zweiflügeligen Insekten. Vol. 1, xxxvi + 333 pp., pl. 1-11. Aachen

RONDANI, C. 1860. Stirpis cecidomyarum. Genera revisa. Nota undecima, pro dipterologia italica. Soc. Ital. di Sci. Nat. Atti (1859–1860) 2 : 286–294, 1 pl.

SABROSKY, C. W. 1967. Corrections to A Catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico. *Entomol. Soc. Amer. Bull.* 13: 115-125

SCHINER, I. R. 1864. Fauna Austriaca. Die Fliegen. Vol. 2, xxxii + 658 pp. Vienna

STEPHENS, J. F. 1829a. The nomenclature of British insects. 68 pp. London

- 1829b. A systematic catalogue of British insects. Vol. 2, 338 pp. London

1846. Illustrations of British entomology. Supplement. 32 (+1 unnumbered) pp., pls. 39-48. London

STONE, Alan, et al. 1965. A catalog of the Diptera of America north of Mexico. U.S. Dept. Agric., Agric. Handbook No. 276, iv + 1696 pp. Washington, D.C.

WESTWOOD, J. O. 1840. An introduction to the modern classification of insects. Synopsis of the genera of British insects. 158 pp. London